



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,420	10/07/2005	John Bolland Reast	65459-802	2394
23529	7590	04/04/2008		
ADE & COMPANY INC. 2157 Henderson Highway WINNIPEG, MB R2G1P9 CANADA			EXAMINER HSIAO, JAMES K	
			ART UNIT 3683	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/552,420

Applicant(s)

REAST, JOHN BOLLAND

Examiner

JAMES K. HSIAO

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, and 8-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cynamon et al. (US-2485434).

Regarding claim 1, Cynamon et al. discloses vehicle suspension comprising a pair of leaf springs locatable on respective opposed sides of a vehicle chassis and extending longitudinally thereof, and an anti-roll device (10) which is arranged to extend transversely of the vehicle chassis, and means mounting opposed ends of the anti-roll device rigidly, to respective ones of the pair of opposed leaf springs (fig 1).

Regarding claim 2, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein said mounting means is arranged to clamp the opposed ends of the anti-roll device rigidly to respective ones of the opposed leaf springs (figs 1 and 3).

Regarding claim 3, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein the anti-roll device has its opposed ends mounted rigidly by said mounting means to any position along the lengths of the pair of opposed leaf springs (figs 1 and 3).

Regarding claim 8, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein the anti-roll device has its opposed ends mounted rigidly by said mounting means to any position along the lengths of the pair of opposed leaf springs (figs 1 and 3).

Regarding claim 9, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein the anti-roll device has its opposed ends mounted rigidly to said mounting means to at least one end of the leaf springs (figs 1 and 3).

Regarding claims 10-13, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein the opposed ends of the anti-roll device are offset from the neutral plane in bending of each of the opposed leaf springs by means of spacers (20).

Regarding claims 14-18, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein said mounting means provides a comparatively large clamping area between said mounting means and the anti-roll device (fig 3).

Regarding claims 19-24, Cynamon et al. discloses wherein the anti-roll device comprises a beam bar or tube (10).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/7/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the arguments that the anti roll device is not rigidly mounted, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Cynamon discloses that the ends of bar 10 are attached to the leaf springs by means of U-bolts which embrace springs 17 and extend upwardly through holes in bar 10. Strong compression springs are mounted on each arm and as seen in figure 3, are locked in place by means of nuts 21. As seen in figure 3, the springs 17 are acting like washers and are locked in place. Therefore it is interpreted as a rigid connection between the bar 10 and springs 17. Regarding the argument that the bar 10 is not mounted to at least one end of the leaf springs,

examiner respectfully disagrees. As seen in figures 1 and 2, the anti-roll bar is located at least at one end of the springs 17. Spring assembly 17 comprises several leaves of different lengths, bar 10 is mounted at one end of the springs. Examiner takes the broadest reasonable interpretation of the limitations set by the claims. The interpretation of the springs 17 is that there are two ends and a middle, the location of the bar 10 is not located in the middle of the springs and is therefore at one of the ends, as seen in figure 2. regarding the argument that the bar 10 is not offset and that the springs 20 are not spacers. Examiner takes the broadest reasonable interpretation of the limitations set by the claims. Springs 20 do take up space and act as washers and are therefore interpreted as spacers. As seen in figures 3 and 2, bar 10 is clearly offset the neutral axis of the springs 17.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES K. HSIAO whose telephone number is (571)272-6259. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Siconolfi can be reached on 571-272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JKH

/Robert A. Siconolfi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3683